

---

Plans & Programs Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)  
of the  
Southern California Association of Governments

March 15, 2007

***Revised Minutes***

---

**THE FOLLOWING MINUTES ARE A SUMMARY THE PLANS & PROGRAMS TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC) MEETING. THE AUDIO CASSETTE TAPE OF THE ACTUAL MEETING IS AVAILABLE FOR LISTENING IN SCAG'S OFFICE.**

The P&P TAC held its meeting at the SCAG Headquarters in Los Angeles. The meeting was called to order by Ty Schuiling, Chair, SANBAG.

**Members Present:**

Ty Schuiling, Chair	SANBAG
Miles, Mitchell, Vice-Chair	LADOT
Shefa Bhuiyan	Caltrans-District 8
Dana Gabbard	So. Ca. Transit Advocates
John McDermott (for Bill Gayk)	Riverside County TLMA
Lori Huddlesston	LACMTA
Jack Humphrey	Gateway Cities COG
Paula McHargue	LAWA
David Mootchnik	So. Cal. Commuters Forum
Gail Shiimoto-Lohr	Orange County COG
John Stesney	LACMTA
Jim Stewart	SCCED
Tony Van Haagen	Caltrans-District 7
Carla Walecka	Transportation Corridor Agencies
Scott Martin	Center for Demographic Research
Michael Litschi	OCTA
Jeff Hamilton	City of Glendale
Bob Cheung	KOA
Frances Lee	Caltrans-District 7
Craig Hoshijima	Public Financial Management
David Sosa	Caltrans-District 7

**Via Conference Call:**

Dr. Paul Fagan	Caltrans-District 8
Brian Kuhn	City of Palmdale
Steve Levy	Center for the Continuing Study of the California Economy

**SCAG Staff:**

Naresh Amatya	Annie Nam
Bob Huddy	Mike Jones
Andre Darmanin	Akiko Yamagami
Frank Wen	Tarek Hatata (System Metrics)
His-hwa Hu	Bill McCullough (System Metrics)
Keith Killough	
Shawn Kuk	

## **1.0 CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS**

Ty Schuiling, Chair, called the meeting to order at 10:10 am. Introductions were made.

## **2.0 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**

There were no public comments.

## **3.0 CONSENT CALENDAR**

### **3.1 Approval Items**

#### **3.1.1 Approve Minutes of February 15, 2007**

Members reviewed minutes and recommended the following changes:

- Gail Shimoto-Lohr on behalf of Deborah Diep (Center for Demographic Research) requested that the following comments be included to Ms. Diep's comments on page 3, paragraph 2, of the minutes: ~~distinct and Ms. Diep inquired~~ if there is ~~a to be a separate distinct~~ RHNA database that is developed, reflecting any revisions to the socio-economic assumptions resulting from any appeals or revisions, ~~should be a that is~~ separate and distinct ~~from the RTP~~ database. The pure projections should be utilized in the RTP.
- Ms. Shimoto-Lohr also requested the following revision be made to page 4, paragraph 3. The following change: "However not all counties forecasts for every revenue source are ~~not~~ forecasted through the entire RTP period."

*Motion was moved, seconded, and unanimously approved.*

### **3.2 Information Items**

#### **3.2.1 SCAG Regional Activities Relevant to RTP Development**

There were no comments.

## **4.0 DISCUSSION ITEMS**

### **4.1 RTP Base Year System Gaps/Deficiencies**

Mr. Bill McCullough, System Metrics presented members with a follow-up preliminary needs assessment of the freeway congestion. Tarek Hatata, System Metrics added that the results included in the presentation are in the draft phase and are subject to change. The presentation included AM and PM peak period models as well as feedback received from the P&P TAC. Due to limited time, the presentation was focused on the AM peak period results.

The needs analysis results on segments presented in February's TAC meeting have changed based on the new PM peak period model results from SCAG. A county-by-county approach was used with the intent to identify the most congested corridors within each county (i.e. corridors that combine to account for at least 33% of total county delay for the period). The 1/3 threshold is still open to discussion by TAC.

Freeway segments were aggregated into corridors based on freeway to freeway segments, then modified based on further analysis. Both HICOMP and PeMS data were also included in the analysis. Bottlenecks identified by PeMS, along with HICOMP data were compared to the model data for correlation, taking into account both speeds and delay.

Visuals of the SCAG 2003 model AM and PM peak period speeds were presented. The PM model showed much greater congestion than the AM model. Speed data was converted into delay by measuring volume and length of the segment. Delay per lane mile was analyzed to distinguish between delays found on long segments with less intensity than those found on shorter segments with higher intensity. Delay per lane mile was then normalized for both AM and PM peak period to provide relativity to congestion intensity levels found in varying environments. The TAC was reminded that the data being presented was still open for discussion and needs technical input from the TAC.

Visuals of congested segments within Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino and Ventura County were presented. They included maps showing segments in the AM peak periods in green and those in the PM peak periods in red. These maps were followed by data tables for each county. A TAC member asked why the I-10 between the 405 and 110 was not noted as a highly congested segment according to the analysis. Mr. McCullough restated that the segments were selected based on the previously discussed 33% threshold for each county's total delay for the period. The I-10 segment in question did not meet this threshold within Los Angeles County.

Mr. Schuiling, commented on the speed related maps showing that the speeds are very low. Mr. Hatata noted that data from the model differs from field data and that models often have higher volumes than observed in the field. The maps represent model data and if we use "observed" volumes and multiplied it by the delay per vehicle figures, the results would be lower than the model-based figures shown on the maps. Mr. Amatya mentioned that if you were to use fifty percent as the criteria, most likely ten segments would show up. Mr. McCullough suggested that a list could be produced of all segments for the TAC to review. Mr. Schuiling stated that the HOV lane on the WB I-210 always has gridlock in the AM and on the following PM peak period slide, only the EB I-210 is shown.

A request was made regarding the list that will be provided to include the volume times delay hours. Agreement was reached to provide this information upon receipt of the final model. Another comment was made stating that it would be better to combine HOV's and mixed flow because the model is not very good on HOV's and is very difficult to model that correctly. Ongoing studies and contracts will be implemented next year to improve this.

Mr. David Mootchnik (So Ca Commuters Forum) inquired about the reliability of the sources being used for the analysis in light of some of the discrepancies being discussed with respect to speed data. Some discussion ensued regarding the difficulties common to modeling and the ability to represent data with 100% accuracy. Various efforts are ongoing in the modeling community to address the issues with speed data. Mr. Hatata commented that the more manageable goal in terms of needs analysis is to identify the major problem areas especially with such a large area as the SCAG region. Mr.

Amatya emphasized that this is a work in progress and that analysis results may change as existing projects are included in the future.

Mr. Mootchnik stated that it is very important to have results grounded by as much raw data as possible. Mr. McCullough then spoke briefly about the issues with HICOMP as raw data is converted to congestion and delay measurements. He then elaborated on the process by which the HICOMP data is integrated with modeling results in order to identify the major congested corridors. A visual analysis of Caltrans generated maps showing congestion on the freeways was overlaid with the HICOMP data to provide an indication of major congested corridors. An analysis of these corridors using HICOMP delay data and the model was also performed.

Mr. McCullough displayed slides on congestion for each county. For the most part, the PM segments remained the same. The 405 and the 101 were identified as the most congested quarters by the model. PeMS also shows severe bottlenecks for these areas. Ms. Shiimoto-Lohr commented that in Los Angeles County, the WB I-210 in the AM period from the 605 to Lake Street from 8am to at least 10:30am is a standing parking lot. In the PM peak period EB on Lake or Rosemead to the 605 is also a sitting parking lot. She inquired as to why this segment was not identified for LA County. Mr. Hatata stated that it did not meet the 33% factor.

Ms. Shiimoto-Lohr asked if staff intends to provide more detailed (e.g. ADT's, speeds, etc.) lists as we move forward. Mr. McCullough confirmed that more detailed lists will be forthcoming.

A TAC member inquired about whether or not a regional approach was pursued in the analysis work. They commented that SCAG is a regional agency and this is a regional document and therefore congestion should be assessed regionally. Mr. Dana Gabbard commented that Caltrans' portion of the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funding is designated for regional needs and that the respective counties should be partnering to address these needs. Mr. Schuiling noted that Caltrans' portion of STIP funding is only 25% and intra-regional agencies (MTA, OCTA, SANBAG, RCTC, etc.) control a 75% share.

Mr. Schuiling noted that the TAC was currently discussing existing conditions but that future conditions will also need to be addressed at some point and are just as significant. He added that the TAC has yet to be presented information on how to solve the identified problems and that the financial burdens appear to be daunting. Mr. Gabbard asked if staff would be able to provide an actual scenario related to projected demand and ultimately what would be needed in terms of a facility improvement. Mr. Schuiling commented that maximizing operational efficiency would be an effective approach especially in more urbanized areas where you are more likely to succeed by providing alternatives, building parallel or improving parallel facilities. Often you will not focus your investment specifically on the corridor in question.

Mr. McCullough continued by addressing individual county segments that met the 33% threshold beginning with Los Angeles County. All but one of the Orange County segments remained unchanged as reported at the February 15<sup>th</sup> meeting. The I-5 SB to Alicia Parkway was no longer on the list perhaps due to modifications of the model. The 405, the 91, and the 57 were the big three for both time periods. Riverside and San Bernardino County congested areas pretty much stayed the same. There were a few

changes in San Bernardino County based on the model results. The NB 15 towards Hesperia became much more congested in this model than in the last one. The 215 dropped out south of the 10. Mr. Schuiling noted that the 10 between the 15 and 215 experiences the worst delay in the entire county right now and also where there is a monitoring problem. Mr. Schuiling added that the NB 15 in the PM over the Cajon Pass, **at the Devore Interchange (the I-15/I-215 Junction)**, is also bad with two freeways merging into one and very high truck volumes.

Mr. Van Haagen asked if a comparison was made between the new model results and the 2000 validation as there tends to be valuable information to be gained typically. Mr. Hatata stated that a comparison had not been made yet. Mr. Schuiling questioned the data regarding the **214 I-215** segment between the 10 and 60 crossing the San Bernardino/Riverside county line. He stated that the heaviest congestion occurs on the NB segment in the PM and not the SB segment.

Mr. McCullough stated that PeMS data shows a bottleneck at Getty on the SB 405 in the PM. The SB 101 in both AM and PM at various locations was also identified by PeMS as showing heavy congestion. PeMS shows greatest bottlenecks at the 101 and the 405. In Orange County you see a repeat of the most congested based on model and HICOMP from the 55 to the 91. The 405 is also a repeat of the AM peak period results. In Riverside County the SR-91 was extended to McKinley and is measured every year by District 8. This is the only corridor that connects Riverside County to Orange County making it one of the most congested. One of the most congested corridors in San Bernardino County is shown on the I-10 from Los Angeles County to the I-15. A new segment that appeared is the 10 east of the 30 in the AM peak period which may be do to an ongoing construction project. The model corresponds very well with what HICOMP recorded this year. Another new segment is the section of the I-15 NB from the I-15/215 to Hesperia. There is no HICOMP data nor was PeMS monitoring on this segment therefore this segment is not validated. Mr. Schuiling stated that this (NB I-15) is an easterly analog of SR-14 and there are 300,000 plus people living north of this area and about half of the labor force has work in that area. He noted that this is a corridor that is recommended for the dedicated truck lane system in the SCAG RTP. Mr. McCullough stated that HICOMP picks up delay south of the 15 and the 215 but congestion seems to be at the Cajon pass. Mr. Schuiling commented that the big interchange at Devore where the 215 and 15 converge has to be completely reconstructed. The straight through move is off of the 215 and the 15 from Ontario goes from 4 lanes to 3 lanes to 2 lanes and ultimately enters the freeway north of the interchange in the right lanes. Mr. Schuiling added that Caltrans just did a **shot SHOPP** project to add a short auxiliary lane on the inside. Mr. McCullough stated that in San Bernardino County, the I-15 SB from 1-10 to the Riverside County line no longer was included the 33% threshold group as was reported at the February TAC meeting.

Mr. McCullough continued with Ventura County, stating that the SR-118 from Simi Valley to Los Angeles County accounts for all of the delay shown in the model and that the congestion disappears once it crosses into LA County per PeMS data.

A TAC member asked why the 710 was not identified as a congested segment despite the heavy volume of truck traffic along the corridor. Mr. Van Haagen noted that trucks can be counted in the analysis as 2 or 3 vehicles and should include PCE factors to increase accuracy. Mr. Hatata replied by stating that a more effective way to measure

for truck delay would be to derive the impact to speeds and then calculate the delay per vehicle and multiply that by total number of vehicles where you count the truck as 1 not 3. He added that a truck would impact the speed but the total delay based on the speed calculated should not double or triple the delay for the truck. Therefore, the speed would be lower and delay would be higher for the segment.

Mr. Mootchnik asked if relying more on monitoring data as opposed to the model would help address issues with certain known congested segments not showing. Mr. Hatata replied that future plans would require in use of the model. Some discussion followed with issues to calibrating the model and resolving its discrepancies with monitoring data. Mr. Hatata suggested that a separate TAC meeting in the future focused on modeling issues with modeling staff present may be an option.

Mr. Miles Mitchell expressed his reservations with regard to using a 33% formula in the needs assessment as it may not represent LA County's needs accurately relative to the other counties. Mr. Mitchell suggested agendaizing for the next TAC meeting a discussion on funding allocation methodology and how actions taken by the TAC may impact funding determinations. Mr. Hatata pointed out that a key difference between the 2004 RTP and the current plan update is that this time around, there is an attempt to evaluate the projects that we have in terms of how they address identified needs. He reiterated that not all congested segments may be addressed but that maybe a function of project costs and limited funding. Mr. Hatata noted that the RTP should demonstrate that the needs will be met and that currently, there is no reason to believe that the county projects are not addressing these needs. He continued by commenting that policy decisions with regard to alternatives may need to be addressed later in the process ultimately by the Regional Council. Mr. Hatata noted the region's current issues with meeting air quality attainment would be a prime example as an impetus for driving potential policy alternatives. Mr. Schuiling inquired on whether or not the RTP will be developed in line with specific performance objectives and that this should be agendaized for a later TAC meeting. Mr. Hatata stated that specific performance objectives were not in place in developing the 2004 RTP and that general policy objectives served as a starting point. However, with the inclusion of truck lanes and Maglev, later modeling results that showed delay per capita to stay the same were included in the 2004 RTP as plan benefits. Mr. Schuiling commented that the absence of performance objectives makes it very difficult to state a case that our resources are insufficient to finance the transportation system that we need. He suggested that the RTP would not prove to be a successful plan if it turns out that when we put all of the strategies together and the net effect is still a 25% increase in per capita delay by 2030. Mr. Schuiling stated that it would be important to have the performance objectives as it would serve to guide the planning work early on in the process. Mr. Hatata suggested that perhaps an hour should be agendaized for the next meeting to further discuss these issues. Mr. Schuiling stated that if we were to establish a technical objective among staff, the TAC would be in a better position to make recommendations to the policy committees and it would be their decision at that point.

The TAC was informed that all comments should be directed to Naresh.



#### 4.2 Compass 2%/RTP Integration

Frank Wen, SCAG, presented on both the Compass 2% - RTP Integration and Growth Forecast items on the meeting agenda. Mr. Wen briefly updated the TAC on staff's efforts with the RHNA process. The RHNA draft was released for public comments on February 1<sup>st</sup>.

Mr. Wen then discussed staff's current efforts with respect to developing a long-term data set for the RTP's planning purposes. Mr. Wen reported that staff has met with several agencies such as MTA and the City of Los Angeles for input as to how their growth allocation distributions around primary corridors have evolved since the 2004 RTP. Mr. Wen stated that through the Integrated Growth Forecast/RHNA workshops, the staff consultant was able to develop a 2035 growth visioning test scenario. This test scenario is based on the adoption of the 2004 RTP growth vision and distribution as well as the implementation of the Compass 2% demonstration projects. In addition, staff has currently received small area allocations from Riverside County and the growth forecast on the SMO level from Orange County.

Mr. Wen stated that staff will be ready to present to the TAC a land use test scenario at the conclusion of the RHNA appeals process and once all the local input has been processed. Staff along with the consultants will lay out the test scenarios based on the 2004 growth visioning principles which will lead into additional scenarios specific to preferred development types and land use distributions along transportation corridors and integrated with committed RTP projects and plan alternatives. Mr. Wen stated that staff anticipates the conclusion of the RHNA appeals process toward the end of April and an updated data set may be available to present to the TAC in early to mid May for discussion of the RTP no project Baseline.

Ms. Shiimoto-Lohr asked that when the RHNA appeals revisions trades and transfers processes are completed, and if there are successful appeals **through which** those housing units would then be distributed to the remaining jurisdictions in the SCAG region that have not accepted sub-regional delegation, if staff intended to adjust the distribution numbers back into a small area geography and assign those units and use that as part of the policy forecast. Mr. Wen stated that the data that staff released at the workshops up to 2014 does reflect the technical trend of the growth forecast. He added that results of the growth visioning process are not used to assign additional growth to jurisdictions. Mr. Wen commented that staff is hopeful that the technical level growth forecast will not be significantly impacted by the appeals process to the extent that it will warrant redistributions with significant impacts at the regional level.

Mr. Shiimoto-Lohr asked if staff anticipates having a 2014 run from the model. Mr. Wen said yes but not because of RHNA but because there are some discrepancies between the number of households provided to AQMD and what was released for RHNA.

A TAC member requested further discussion of the how the RTP will integrate with the 2% strategy and subsequent growth scenarios. Mr. Amatya stated that the requested discussion may take place in 2 to 3 months at the completion of the needs assessment process.

### 4.3 Transportation Finance

Ms. Annie Nam, SCAG, provided members with a brief update of the revenue model based on updated data has been provided by MTA and SANBAG. Ms. Nam reported that the Transportation Corridor **Agency Agencies** (TCA) is in the process of updating its forecast and will be providing information shortly. Fuel sales tax and bridge rehab funding numbers have also been included into the financial model. Any questions or comments can be addressed to Tarek Hatata. The development fee for Los Angeles County is not being included and is simply a study at this point. This may be included as part of the alternative funding strategy. Ms. Lori Huddleston (MTA) noticed that in 1996 there was about \$66 million in mitigation fees in Los Angeles County and asked if staff knew what that was for. Ms. Nam stated that it may have been for the Red Line Benefit Assessment District but would need to verify that information.

Ms. Nam continued with regard to the forecast model. The total preliminary forecast is \$212 billion in transportation revenues for the SCAG region and is from 2006 – 2036 in 2005 dollars. The differences are accounted for by the number of years. The preliminary forecast covers 31 years. A revenue drop was not included from alternative fuel fleet penetration. Sales tax extension measures have also been added along with additional state funds.

There was some discussion on whether or not gasoline tax revenues should be assumed to serve as a strong revenue source in the revenue model. Ms. Nam stated that a growth rate or increase is not assumed in the model and that the topic deserves further discussion.

Ms. Nam continued by stating that in the previous forecast, only a portion of the gas tax subvention dollars were used recognizing that not all of those dollars are spent on regionally significant roadways. This time we took the total subvention figures from the state controller's reports. Mr. Schuiling commented that very little of the local gas tax subvention is spent on regionally significant facilities and that this assumption also deserves further discussion. Mr. Schuiling also inquired on what the "other federal" category represented. Ms. Nam replied that there were various discretionary categories that could not be captured and were included in this category. Further details can be provided at a later time.

Ms. Nam reminded the TAC that this model is still in the preliminary phases and has not yet taken into account carry over balances. Staff is still comparing assumptions with CTC staff. Mitigation forecasts also need to be further refined.

Ms. Carla Walecka asked if all of the public revenues and all of the private initiatives will be presented in more detail. Ms. Nam replied that what was being presented are public revenues although toll road revenues generated by the TCA are included in this baseline forecast. She added that staff is also working on business plans for some of the private initiatives that were in the previous plan (2004 RTP) and will be presented to TAC at a later time.

Ms. Huddleston asked what farebox ratio was assumed for the MTA. Ms. Nam stated that figures from MTA's long range plan have been incorporated in the model and that she is also cognizant of pending policy changes from the MTA board.



Ms. Shiimoto-Lohr inquired about the tax apportionment to counties and constituent cities with respect to Prop 42 funds and how it will be included in the revenue forecast for the RTP. Ms. Nam replied that there is a subvention component for Prop 42 funds that is reflected in the finance model. Ms. Shiimoto-Lohr requested that the model assumptions on Prop 42 and Prop 1B local subventions being discussed be revisited because the cities are using all of this to deal with resurfacing and local projects.

Mr. Mootchnik asked if staff was aware of what fraction of federal gasoline tax generated by the SCAG region comes back to the region and if anything is being done to affect the shortfall that we see in this area? Ms. Nam replied that SCAG has always argued that we are not getting the region's fair share. With SAFETEA-LU there were some provisions to step up the return. This will need to be addressed in the forecast.

Ms. Walecka asked if the assumption was that the region will continue to receive about 92%. Ms. Nam replied that the assumption is we will continue to receive what we are currently receiving.

#### 4.4 Transportation System Preservation

Mr. Tarek Hatata presented members with the system preservation guiding principles. Mr. Hatata noted that SAFETEA-LU has an area for MPO planning where the planning process must emphasize the preservation of the existing system. Mr. Hatata presented the State Highway Operations and Planning Program (SHOPP) chart which illustrates pavement conditions vs. cost of repair.

Mr. Hatata stated that reliable studies are being sought to assess preservation needs. He urged discussion from the TAC on what can be done to affect state level funding decisions referring to SHOPP and STIP. Mr. Schuiling commented that due to increasing constraints on federal funding, funds for preservation efforts that used to fall into the ~~STIP per SB2045~~ SHOPP per SB4035 are no longer available. Mr. Hatata stated that the TAC should discuss an approach to provide to our policy makers if the federal funds are not enough and the state funds go directly to STIP without getting to SHOPP. Discussion continued regarding decreasing resources to meet preservation needs and the TAC's role in developing policy strategies. No specific preferred action or strategy was agreed upon by the committee at this point.

Mr. Hatata reported that requests have been made to the counties to try and collect as much data as possible related to pavement quality on local roads and arterials. Ms. Shiimoto-Lohr inquired about what the cost increase for pavement repairs has been since the 2004 RTP. She also agreed to provide staff with data on arterials.

#### 4.5 Standing Items

##### 4.5.1 Growth Forecast

This item was presented by Frank Wen, SCAG, during Item 4.2.

##### 4.5.2 Highways and Arterials

##### 4.5.2.1 CMIA Program Update

Mr. Naresh Amatya, SCAG, reported on the CTC adopted CMIA program. Mr. Amatya stated that there are a number of projects that are inconsistent with the existing RTP because they are either not in the current plan (2004 RTP), or they are scoped or scheduled differently, or have cost changes, etc. SCAG is attempting to amend the existing RTP to reflect these changes. He added that staff is currently working to amend the plan by the July 1, 2007 deadline (statutory for SAFETEA-LU).

Mr. Mitchell asked about the schedule/timeline for the RTP update work and requested that it be distributed to the TAC when available. He commented that it would be important for the TAC to be aware of these dates and be cognizant of the process that lies ahead, especially in terms of milestones and key decision points. Mr. Amatya replied that staff intends to have the draft RTP completed by end of October. Mr. Amatya stated that staff will distribute more information on this topic before the next meeting.

#### 4.5.3 Non-Motorized / TDM

There was nothing to report.

### 5.0 STAFF REPORT

Mr. Naresh Amatya, SCAG, briefed TAC on the RTP Workshop held at SCAG on March 1, 2007 on Transportation Finance. He reported that the workshop was a great success that the next workshop was scheduled for April 5, 2007 to discuss air quality issues. Mr. Amatya encouraged the TAC to participate and stated that the next meeting in April may need to be rescheduled due to the MPO Inter Modal planning meeting with the FHWA/FTA.

### 6.0 ADJOURNMENT

Chair Ty Schuiling, adjourned the meeting at 12:20 pm. The next meeting of the Plans & Programs Technical Advisory Committee was tentatively scheduled to be held at SCAG's Los Angeles office on April 19, 2007.